Special 6-Page Issue

Full Text: Israeli Foreign Minister Golda Meir's National Press Club Speech, Pages Four and Five

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 48 DECEMBER 17, 1956 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Paradoxical Moment In Budapest That Made 1956 Historic

When The Soviet Government Smashes Soviets

We wonder how many readers, scanning the news from Budapest, remembered that "Soviet" means council in Russian and that Soviets originated in the workers' councils which sprang up in the factories of Moscow during the Revolution of 1905. The workers' councils whose dissolution the Soviet government and its feeble Hungarian puppet have been trying to enforce with blood and fire are the direct descendants of those workers' councils through which the Communists first came to power in 1917. These factory councils proved as powerful against the Kremlin and Kadar as they once were against the Czars and Kerensky. December, 1956, will be remembered in the history books as the time when a government which calls itself Soviet turned its guns in panic on Soviets. In this vivid scene perished the delusion that mistook a dictatorship of bureaucrats and gendarmes for a working class utopia. If events are to be gauged by their impact on men's minds, this was the most important event of the year, outranking even Khrushchev's posthumous attack on Stalin. Whatever happens inside Hungary, its workers have succeeded in bringing about a new revolution.

Proletarian, But Not A Mob

Yet for those of us who look back with filial piety on our ideological forbears and who glory (despite Walters and Eastlands) in the tradition of our country, it was a joy to see in this new revolution far off upon the Danube the rebirth of our own Jeffersonianism. One of the two major demands of the workers' councils in their ultimatum to the Kadar government was the right to establish a labor press, free from control by the government. The Sage of Monticello, a philosophical country gentleman, always distrusted the urban proletariat but he would have felt an immediate kinship with the workers of Budapest. They acted out of old and festering grievances in the spirit of Jefferson's often repeated emphasis on a free press as the primary safeguard of liberty. The workers of Budapest destroyed another Stalinist delusion—that the Soviet system (as embodied in the Stalin Constitution) is "even more democratic" than ours because it not only guarantees a free press but makes available presses "free" to the workers. Outside Poland, nowhere in the Soviet zone, can a worker get anywhere near that dangerous weapon the press, and in Russia it has been a long time since any protesting worker dared print even a mimeographed leaflet.

A Capitalist Neo-Trotzkyism

In the wake of this new revolution, still convulsing and spreading in East Europe, even making itself felt in Lithuania, there reappears in reverse another well-known phenomena of politics. In the 20's, though it preached world revolution, the Stalin government cold-shouldered and soft-pedalled the revolutionary movement, first in Germany and then in China, when it looked as if revolution were at last possible. This was the "sell-out" in which Trotzkyism was born. Today we are seeing a similar tendency on the other side. Faced at last with the possibility of that "liberation" they so long preached, Mr. Dulles and his friends in West Germany are soft-pedalling the anti-Communist revolution. From the NATO meeting in Paris we are told that Bonn has given its agents in East Germany strict orders to avoid anything which might lead to an insurrection there; Mr. Dulles's emphasis on "morality" as the sole weapon is regarded as a signal to Moscow that it can crush the new revolution without fear of our intervention in its behalf.

Just as Stalin once feared that revolution in Germany and China might lead to war with the West, so the West now fears that the new revolution in Eastern Europe may lead to war with Russia. In both cases revolutionary phrases evaporated when it became a question of taking risks to fulfill them; crisis showed Dulles like Stalin was a cautious conservative not an adventurer. This is understandable when nuclear weapons are poised for action. We merely note the reappearance of a pattern. But already from the bombed out cellars of Budapest one may hear the same anger and disillusion with Washington that betrayed German and Chinese revolutionists once felt with Moscow.

The (Worried) Watch on The Rhine

West Germany, American capitalism's junior partner, prefers Stalinist stability in East Europe; here Ulbricht and Adenauer see eye to eye. Business is booming in the Ruhr, and the men who served Hitler Fascism so faithfully are in no mood to take risks for freedom. This is a prime determinant of U.S. policy. One reason for loans to England is to keep British divisions in West Germany; otherwise England must withdraw from the Rhineland as well as Suez. Next to British anger with the U.S. over Egypt is its anger with West Germany, which prefers to let England shoulder the burden of defending the Reich while it pursues its export business unburdened by armament. The shift from Hoover to Herter may be viewed as a shift from an isolationist and pro-German personality to an internationalist and pro-British one; a new Marshall Plan may be in the offing. But this, if one watches closely, is as necessary now for German as American interest. Bonn fears the collapse of NATO. It also fears the collapse of the Warsaw pact. While business is so good, the masters of the Ruhr are for politics as usual.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now That President Eisenhower Has Invoked It for Hungary . . .

When Are We Going to Ratify That UN Bill of Human Rights?

Memo to the White House: In drafting that new set of regulations for government security procedures necessitated by the Cole decision, we hope the President's indictment of the Hungarian regime on United Nations Human Rights Day will be remembered: "It denies the right to fair and public hearings by an independent and impartial tribunal," Mr. Eisenhower said of the Kadar regime. (Harry Cain lost his job for daring to make just that observation about the way government employes are tried in Washington for loyalty and security.) . . . **Remember Genocide?** And this is a good point at which to recall that the U.S. has never submitted to the Senate for ratification the convention embodying that UN Declaration of Human Rights the President invoked. The U.S. position has always been that the UN should concern itself with the relations between nations, not between nations and their citizens. The same reasons were given for U.S. opposition to the UN pact against genocide. If the Declaration of Human Rights is applicable in Hungary, why not in the USA? . . . **Free Right of Entry:** We suspect the same kind of qualms arose when Senator Humphrey last week suggested that the U.S. sponsor a resolution allowing the UN Secretary General and his agents full freedom of movement for inspection within a member State whenever as in Hungary's case it had been subjected to a "special charge." Humphrey's proposal was made to Lodge and is "under consideration" in Washington, which may in this connection be more worried about Bricker than Budapest. . . .

New Angle on That Second Front: According to a speech by Retired Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer in Omaha Dec. 8, East Europe would be free of the Russians today if Churchill had not delayed the opening of a second front in Europe. The General said the U.S. wanted to invade Normandy in 1943 before the Russians could get beyond Poland but the British were more concerned with the Mediterranean. So those who advocated a second front were, we suppose, premature unconscious anti Communists. . . . **Add Profits of Scarcity:** The shipping industry is preparing to lobby against new legislation at the next session of Congress allowing the government to sell some of the 2,000 vessels in its "mothball" fleet. At present special legislation is required for each sale. With the Suez closed, shipping is tight and demand heavy from foreign governments and U.S. companies which now need new tonnage quickly. But the shipping industry naturally would rather restrict the supply. . . . **Leftward on Power:** In fairly well informed sources (believe it or not) there is expectation of a leftward shift by the GOP on power, abandoning the "partnership" with private enterprise formula for more public projects; Far Western election returns are credited with the reported shift. . . .**No Ike Veto This Time?** The natural gas lobby hopes to succeed at the next session in enacting exemption from Federal control; the ways are being greased for smooth and decorous action to avoid scandal and an Ike veto.

Signs of the Times: Archibald Macleish at a recent reading in the Library of Congress read a poem in honor of Laurence Duggan, the brilliant young State Department official who committed suicide (to the glee of Senator Mundt) during the witch hunt a few years ago. . . . **On the Other Hand:** The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee found only one radio station in New York (Hearst's WINS) willing to sell it time for a speech by the economist J. Raymond Walsh commemorating the 165th anniversary of the Bill of Rights. WINS insisted, however, on prior approval of the script and turned it down as "controversial." The ECLC has put it on a platter for civil liberties groups which can be obtained free from the committee at 421 Seventh Avenue, New York City. . . .

Fast Work: The UAW complains that though a test election law case is pending against it (see last week's issue) in the Supreme Court, a new one based on the same facts has been launched without waiting for the decision. "The day after election, almost as if the Eisenhower victory had been the signal to act," the UAW board protested, "agents for the Federal Bureau of Investigation appeared at five UAW local union offices and at the Flint CIO Council office to demand the books . . . as part of a fishing expedition by the U. S. Attorney General." The UAW points out that no effort has been made to investigate the well known devices by which corporations get around the Federal law forbidding direct campaign contributions, including "the fake bonus . . . the substantial contribution by the boss's secretary, the pressure on sales outlets to make contributions." . . .

Notorious Subversive

"Thanks to the Walter McCarran Act and the so-called Un-American Activities Committtee, we have so far forgotten whence we sprang that if our Lord were to be here He would be deported and if He were to apply for admission, He would be denied."

—The Rt. Rev. Walter Mitchell, former Episcopal Bishop of Arizona, addressing a meeting in Los Angeles Dec. 4 to protest House committee subpoenas for the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, of which he is honorary chairman.

AFL-CIO Publications Director Protests "Dubious Delegate's" View of Labor Press

Dear Izzy:

With many of the views expressed by Dubious Delegate [in the Weekly of Dec. 10], I disagree—as I am sure would a large proportion of the ILPA [International Labor Press Association] members. Dubious Delegate is entitled to his opinions—but his concept that labor should live in an unheated garret is essentially unsound.

There are some factual errors that I do not believe should go unchallenged:

1. The AFL-CIO News does not "abound in praise" of George Meany. He is the President of the AFL-CIO, and in any labor paper, he makes news. We do not participate in a "cult of personality" type of worship—and I suspect Mr. Meany would be the first to crack down on any such policy.

2. An anonymous editor is quoted as suggesting that there aren't any pictures of working men in the AFL-CIO News. A re-reading might be in order for the complainant.

3. More serious is the alleged skepticism concerning John Vandercook's assertion that "nobody has told me what to say." The skepticism, if it did exist among the editors, is ill-founded. Both Edward Morgan and John Vandercook are employes of ABC radio, not of AFL-CIO. They are not told what to say; and each of them has been known to say, vigorously, things that conflict with official AFL-CIO policy. But neither Morgan nor Vandercook is an official spokesman of the AFL-CIO; they are sponsored news commentators and analysts.

Dubious Delegate says, "Vandercook's contract is up for renewal soon." The fact is that the contract is in the process, now, of being formally renewed.

Sincerely Yours,

Henry C. Fleisher

Director, Dept. of Publications, AFL-CIO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Daily Worker Is Accused of Red-Baiting and New York Teachers Complimented

Only A TVA of TV Can Protect the Public Interest in Television

A TVA of the TV Waves? The scanty coverage given UN sessions on Hungary and the Middle East was criticized by the seven judges who made the Sylvania TV awards for 1956. They touched on that "direct conflict" which arises "between commercial interests and TV's obligation to provide important services." No one seems to have the temerity to suggest that instead of giving away all the nation's TV channels to these commercial companies, at least one be recovered for public ownership and public service. A public corporation independent of political control could easily be established to run a national channel of this kind, and the existence of commercial channels would assure a healthy competition between them.

Red-Baiting Daily Worker? Letters to the editor in the *Daily Worker* accusing it of "red-baiting" are no longer a novelty. Editor John Gates and his staff have been doing an extraordinarily independent job, but the rumor is that they are slated for a purge as soon as Foster's old guard feels stronger. In circles which reflect Stalinist standpattism, I even heard the *Daily* described as now an "anti Communist" paper! . . . **A Tribute to Teachers:** In a public letter to New York City Board of Education President Charles H. Silver, Rose Russell of the Teachers Union called attention to a revealing passage in an affidavit by the Board's "special investigator" Saul Moskoff. "During the course of the entire investigation," Moskoff recited, "no teacher has ever appeared voluntarily for the purpose of furnishing information with respect to subversive activities in the New York City school system." The affidavit was attached to the Board's petition to the courts, asking reversal of the State Education Commission James E. Allen, Jr.'s ruling that teachers cannot be dismissed for refusing to inform. . . . **"Precautionary":** A Long Island school district last month cancelled a forum which was to have been addressed by Prof. Henry Steele Commager on "The American Presidency." A school official explained "some people" felt he became "controversial" when he signed a Smith Act amnesty petition and the school board cancelled the forum as a "precautionary" measure. . . .

Too Busy Joyously Acclaiming

"The Hungarian working people are joyously acclaiming reports of the increasing aid to Hungary from the Soviet Union, People's China, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries. Currently, from 550 to 600 boxcars, loaded with the most diverse commodities, arrive in Hungary daily via Zahon station alone. In order to unload the freight trains at Zahon Station government agencies have appealed to workers, peasants and the youth to help in this important state matter."

—*"The Situation in Hungary," Izvestia, Dec. 1.*

If everything were not so joyful, we would suspect that the freight handlers were on strike, too.

How Lenin Differed From Stalin

No one knows yet whether Molotov's recent appointment as Minister of State Control was a step up or down, a move which strengthens the Stalinists or the reformers. Potentially, this Ministry could evercise vast power; actually, it has in latter years been not much more than an audit and control agency. The Ministry originated in the Commissariat of Workers and Peasant Inspection set up after the Revolution, and known from its Russian initials as "Rabkrin." It was as the head of Rabkrin from 1919 until he became party general secretary in 1922 that Stalin began to lay the foundations for his power.

Leonard Schapiro in his illuminating "Origins of the Communist Autocracy: Political Opposition in the Soviet State: 1917 to 1922" published in London last year describes Rabkrin as "a vast bureaucratic engine for control over the administration of economic life." He quotes from a letter about Rabkrin which Lenin wrote to Stalin (Sept. 29, 1921) as illustrating the difference between the two. "The task of Rabkrin," Lenin admonished Stalin (p. 340 of Schapiro's book), "is not only, indeed not so much as at present, to 'catch' and 'expose' people . . . *as to know how to improve them.*"

And So It Goes: Latest in that local controversy over George Washington University's ban on faculty members who do not believe in God was a sermon last Sunday by an Episcopal minister saying this missed the point. What really matters he said is what *kind* of God the faculty member believes in. Why not be sure and just bar all teachers who do not believe in transubstantiation? (Look it up; it was once a ferocious test of orthodoxy—and if the revival of theological nonsense spreads could be again). . . . **New Way to Frighten Federal Employees:** Jerry Kluttz, who covers the civil service for the *Washington Post*, disclosed in a copyrighted story December 9 hitherto secret Department of Justice rulings that a government employe could be prosecuted under the "conflict of interest" statute for helping a discharged colleague get back his job. One official told Kluttz former Senator Harry Cain could have been prosecuted for helping victims of the witch hunt in government while he was himself an "employe" on the Subversive Activities Control Board. The statute was intended to keep government officials from cashing in on their influence by representing private claimants against the government, but Brownell and Warren Olney beginning in August, 1953, turned it into a device to intimidate Federal employes organizing informal aid to workers fired for "security" and other reasons. . . .

A Document Which Helps Explain Why Workers Rebel Against A "Workers" State

"Poland's chief labor body has called for direct representation of trade unions in the country's Parliament (Sejm) to help shape legislation especially on wages, employment and other features of economic and social life.

"The proposal was embodied in a resolution adopted by the Central Council of Trade Unions after a three day meeting in Warsaw last month during which strong criticism was voiced of bureaucratic methods and of leaders who kept the unions from playing an independent role.

"The Council elected Ignacy Loga-Sewinski as its new chairman in place of Wiktor Klosiewicz and recalled several members of the Council secretariat. The size of the Council was increased to 157.

"Mr. Loga-Sewinski, the CCTU's former secretary, is 42 years old and has long been active in trade union affairs. During the Nazi occupation he was the leader of an anti-fascist workers' organization in Lodz and after the war he headed the district union council in Wroclaw. He has been a member since last October of the Political Bureau of the Polish United Workers Party.

"Much of the criticism voiced at the Council session was directed at what was described as bureaucratic centralism which distorted the functioning of unions and undermined their independence. THE UNIONS, IT WAS SAID, HAD TURNED INTO INSTITUTIONS DIRECTED FROM ABOVE AND HAD NOT ADEQUATELY PROTECTED WORKERS." [Emphasis added.]

—Polish Embassy press release, Dec. 10

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Full Text: Golda Meir's Speech at the National Press Club, December 11

Israel's Famous Woman Foreign Minister States Its Case

The Middle Eastern crisis is far from over. Last week at the National Press Club in Washington, Mrs. Golda Meir, a one-time Milwaukee school teacher, now Israel's Foreign Minister, delivered an address which states Israel's case for the October 29 attack and its warning that trouble lies ahead if the UN merely restores the status quo ante. Her directness and simplicity made a deep impression on an audience not easily impressed and since it was not published in full elsewhere we are reprinting it here as indispensable for an understanding of coming events. Mrs. Meir, whom I first met in Israel in 1945, is one of the great pioneer women of that country; it is easy to understand Prime Minister Ben Gurion's remark about her, "the best man I've got."—IFS

I greatly value the opportunity of speaking from this platform today. The friendship between America and Israel has deep and enduring foundations. When your great nation was itself still young in freedom and independence, over 140 years ago, its second President, John Adams, wrote: "I really wish the Jews again in Judea, an independent nation restored to an independent government." That tradition of American sympathy for the restoration of Israel has never been broken. Its roots, which lie in our common spiritual heritage, have been nurtured by our common historic experience and our common devotion to democracy. The people of Israel have indelible memories of the great moral and practical aid that your nation has given us from the day our State was re-established. Whatever differences may arise in our appraisals of Middle Eastern developments, they do not, I know, affect the essential friendship between our nations, and our community of beliefs and interests.

May I add here that I am deeply grateful for the great understanding shown by American public opinion since this crisis began, and for the countless messages of encouragement that have reached me since I came here a few weeks ago.

If I recall now the events that led to that action, it is not only in the hope that I may help provide a clearer view for those who are remote from our region, but also because of my conviction that the world may yet pay a tragic price, as it already has done in our generation, if it fails to judge aright the realities that created this crisis.

The Question on Oct. 29

For the Government and people of Israel the question which hung in the balance on 29th of October was grim and inescapable: destruction, on the one hand, or survival and the peaceful pursuit of constructive tasks, on the other. It was a source of deep distress to us that, in the face of the mounting crisis, so much apathy and so many facile assessments and delusions about the real issues of the Middle East continued to exist in the free world. Revolutionary changes were taking place in this strategically-placed area. In a region where dictatorship, oppression and feudal regimes were the rule, where democracy has never flourished, where, in the midst of vast oil wealth, the great masses of the people live in a state of sodden misery and poverty—here Israel came to rebirth again eight years ago in its ancient homeland, a nation dedicated to democracy, peace and progress. To the dictators and feudal rulers around it, the symbol that Israel represents in a democratic, human, social sense was highly disturbing. Under one pretext or another, they rejected our offers of peace and sought every means to make peaceful life impossible for us. Their hostility was directed not only against Israel and the values its stood for, but also against all who cherish similar values.

When the royal regime of Egypt was overthrown in 1952 by revolutionaries whose purpose seemed to be to lift their people to a new and better life we held out a hand of friendship to them. For we have no wish to be the only modern, progressive, democratic state in our area. The Prime Minister of Israel, Mr. David Ben Gurion, addressed himself from our parliament to those young Egyptian leaders on that occasion: "Israel wishes," he said, "to see Egypt free, independent, progressing. There have been no grounds, nor are there now, for any quarrel between Egypt and Israel. There is no cause for territorial disputes, nor any reason for political or economic differences."

Then Nasser Came to Power

Then Colonel Nasser came to power. Driven by the obsession that he was the chosen instrument to dominate all the Arab nations, all of Islam, to lead Asia and North Africa, he became the vehicle by which Soviet power entered the Middle East. The Arab-Israel conflict was the pretext. The real motive was Nasser's limitless thirst for power.

For Israel, the menace of Arab hostility under the direction of Colonel Nasser took on deadly new dimensions. The precarious stability that had existed previously in spite of Arab hostility was now gravely impaired by the vast quantities of Soviet arms pouring into Egypt. "Israel has no right to exist," Nasser proclaimed, and under his direction the state of war against Israel which the Arab States had declared was given new force.

I shall not elaborate here on the blockade in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba, the warlike acts committed by land as well as by sea; the constant blockade and boycott; the attempts at strangling us economically by every means, even to the extent of blackmailing other nations that traded with us; the endless threats of annihilation that his regime directed at us. Above all, Col. Nasser savagely intensified the operations of the trained murder gangs sent day in, day out, across our frontiers. In October of this year, after he had concerted military plans with Jordan and Syria for an assault against us from three sides, his Chief of Staff announced, "We shall choose the day."

200 Times Discussed

At the Security Council, the Arab-Israel conflict had been discussed 200 times in all these years. The United Nations seemed powerless to do more than consider each isolated incident after it had arisen.

This, then, was the situation that faced us on October 29—to resign ourselves as the attack grew in ferocity until Nasser chose the day for the final blow, or, having found no other remedy, to exercise our inherent right of self-defense.

I would remind you gentlemen that in the long history of the Jewish people, from the days of antiquity until Hitler, we have found ourselves too often the object of physical holocaust, and thereafter the subject of moral eulogies. Now, having been entrusted by our people with responsibility for the integrity of the State and the security of its people, we were determined that our State should live, and decided to act for our survival today, not wait and provide a subject for a postmortem tomorrow.

Not to Acquire Territory

We did not enter the Sinai Peninsula to acquire territory but to wipe out the bases of attack against us. What we found there revealed that the danger was greater and more imminent than we had realized. The preparations were more elaborate, the concentrations of offensive strength and equipment greater than we had known, and among the military directives to the Egyptian commanders that we captured we found this order: "Every commander is to prepare himself and his subordinates for the inevitable campaign against Israel for the purpose of fulfilling our exalted aim, which is to annihilate Israel and bring about her destruction in the shortest possible time in the most brutal and savage battles." These documents have been submitted to the United Nations.

At the request of the United Nations, and on the recommendation of President Eisenhower, we have undertaken to remove our troops from the territory of Egypt immediately upon the conclusion of satisfactory arrangements with the United Nations in connection with the emergency international force. We are executing our obligation and have completed a part of it. But the point that must be stressed again and again is that the implementation of this request of the United Nations must ensure peace for the future. That is the crux of the issue. That is the real challenge. If the United Nations will merely clear the way for Nasser to return to Sinai and Gaza with new fury, new resources and vastly greater outside aid, if it will attempt to restore the resumption of the blockade in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba to Israel ships and the shipping of other nations trading with Israel, then the setting will merely have been created for a conflagration far graver than the last.

Will Not Be A Passive Victim

Israel, I would emphasize, will never be a passive victim. But Israel is only Nasser's first intended victim. His ambitions in the Middle East, in the whole of the African Continent, have been publicly expounded. As recently as June 19, he said: "We must be strong to liberate the entire Arab land from Morocco to Baghdad and to retrieve the rights of Palestine's people." Whom, one might ask, does he plan to liberate? Morocco from the Moroccans? Iraq from the Iraqis?

The subversion and tension that Col. Nasser set in motion in the Middle East is still running its course. Against whom, for example, are intended the Soviet arms being massed in Syria? If it is mainly on the crisis of Egypt that the eyes of the world are focused, this hour is one of decision for the whole of the Middle East. The United Nations dare not allow itself to be deflected now from the basic issue. The issue is not merely one of withdrawal. The question is what situation should

(*Continued on Page 5*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Will The UN Set The Stage for A Greater Conflagration By Unconditional Withdrawal?"

Arab Leaders Accused of Not Wanting to Solve The Refugee Problem

(*Continued from Page 4*)

the United Nations create in the course of implementing its resolutions. For us the answer is clear.

What Israel Wants

There must be real assurance for Israel against aggression. There must be freedom of navigation for all nations through the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba. There must be no possibility whatever of Egypt threatening or conducting hostilities against Israel from the previous positions occupied by its armies. The United Nations is in a position, if it approaches the question in a constructive spirit, to assure these legitimate aims. Beyond the settlement of these specific problems lies the question of a permanent settlement. Here, the most effective contribution of the United Nations can be to call Israel and her neighbors to direct negotiations for peace.

If the United States has played a distinguished role in sponsoring Israel's independence, it has also played no small part in the emancipation of the Arab people. In little more than a generation, ten sovereign, independent states have arisen in a vast area of three million square miles. That achievement owes much to American sympathy and support. A vigorous American policy of peace in the Arab-Israel problem does not imply a partisan attitude. Nor is it partisanship to recognize that in a peaceful progressive Middle East, the right of statehood and sovereignty belongs to Israel no less than to each and every one of the ten Arab states.

The Refugee Problem

While Israel cherishes its freedom and independence and is determined to preserve them, it does not begrudge its Arab neighbors their freedom and the great territories they have inherited as sovereign states. We are ready today, as we have always been, to negotiate a just and honorable peace. But it must be a peace by agreement, a peace in which they recognize that we have the same rights and freedoms in our tiny area that we recognize they have in theirs. There are no practical problems between the Arabs and Israel which are insoluble, given only the wish to solve them fairly. The Arab states cannot envy us any portion of our very small territory, less than one three-hundredth part of theirs. Should any Arab leaders be genuinely fearful of Israel, what better safeguard could they have than a freely-negotiated peace agreement, or even, as an alternative we have previously offered, a non-aggression pact guaranteed by the United Nations? If they seek to justify their rejection on the grounds of the Arab refugee problem, they know well that not only was that problem of their making when they launched war against Israel on the day of its birth, but also that this problem, bitter as it is, is no less susceptible of solution than the much bigger refugee problems that arose in India and Pakistan, in Greece and Turkey, in Europe after World War II. All these have been solved by resettlement.

Indeed, Israel itself has demonstrated a solution of a refugee problem, not smaller numerically than the Arab refugee problem. I hope you will bear with me if I dwell for a few minutes on our refugee problem. We were a people of 650,000 when the State of Israel was established in 1948. Above the chaos left by the departing mandatory Government was the terrible havoc caused by the Arab invasion. The country itself, 8,000 square miles in area and more than half of it desolate, was poorly endowed with natural resources. The machinery of government was in its infancy. Yet within 18 months we had absorbed 350,000 refugees, the remnants of Hitler's concentration camps, within two and a half years the figure had risen to 550,000, and year after year they continued to pour in. It is now 850,000. As many as 350,000 of them were forced to flee from the Arab countries. It was not our actions that had made all these people into refugees. We might have had grounds to do nothing but nurse a bitter grievance against those who had exiled our people. Instead, we did everything in our power to build a new life for them. Our poor rations were divided with them and the whole country lived through a period of rigorous austerity. Before proper accommodations could be provided, we heavily reduced our existing living quarters so that an average of 2 and 3 persons lived in a room. Fired by the vision of service to these unfortunate kinsmen, the best of our youth went out to help and train them. We grappled with stupendous social problems, for these people came from countries a thousand years apart in social customs and experience. We had great help from the outside, from the Jewish people in other lands and from friendly governments, especially your own. But the main burden was ours and we shouldered it eagerly.

Arab Treatment of Arabs

Compare this with the Arab treatment of the Arab refugees. Here are gigantic Arab territories with vast, underpopulated spaces and great unharnessed rivers for irrigation. Here is oil wealth amounting to over 880 million dollars per annum. The United Nations voted a fund of $200,000,000 for Arab refugee resettlement. The Eric Johnston Jordan project of the United State Government would have provided homes for 300,000 Arab refugees. Israel, for its part, announced its readiness to compensate the refugees for the property they abandoned. All the conditions existed for the Arab governments to solve this problem if they really wished to do so.

An Open Sore

Why then, has the Jewish refugee problem ceased to exist and the Arab refugee problem still plagued the Middle West and the world? It is because we wanted to solve the Jewish refugee problem and the Arab leaders do not want to solve the Arab refugee problem. It is the shocking truth that to maintain hostility to us the Arab governments are sacrificing every opportunity of restoring their kinsmen to a decent, productive life. Instead, with the exception of Jordan, they have erected an impenetrable barrier between these fellow-Arabs and themselves, only in order, as a former representative of the United Nations relief organization has said, to preserve the refugee camps "as an open sore, as an affront against the United Nations and a weapon against Israel."

Mr. Chairman, the absence of peace, and the deterioration of the situation to inevitable explosion point, is due solely to the vindictive and barren refusal of the Arab leaders, with Colonel Nasser as their head, to accept the existence of Israel as an unchangeable reality. This hostility is deliberately fostered and nurtured. One Arab ruler, King Abdullah of Jordan, recognized that peace was in the Arab no less than the Israel interest. We had actually reached agreement with him on the terms of peace. But the former Mufti of Jesusalem, now one of Nasser's band of international troublemakers in Cairo, saw to it that that agreement should be frustrated by the assassination of Abdullah.

Today, the future in the Middle East is still in suspense—open for disaster if the statesmen of the world fail to ensure that the clock is not turned back; and open to peace, if no one is left in doubt that peace in the Middle East is one of the most urgent international objectives of our time.

We Wish All Our Readers A Merry Christmas & A Happy New Year

The *Weekly* is published only 48 times a year; it does not go to press the last two Thursdays in December or August. The next issue will go to press on January 3. It will be Vol. V, No. 1, and we are grateful as we approach that milestone. This experiment in independent journalism, carrying on through one of the worst periods for nonconformity in American history, has succeeded. Returns this fall are 30 percent above last. You can help us reach more readers by giving the *Weekly* as a Christmas gift. We are offering it at the special rates of $4 for one; $7.50 for two; $10 for three. We hope 1957 will see a lessening of conflict abroad and a further abatement of the witch hunt at home, and we take advantage of this occasion again to thank readers for the many kind notes coming in with renewals. It has been a joy these last four years to cover such tremendous events for so wonderful an audience from so congenial a ringside seat, free—thanks to you—to write as I please.

Your friend,

I. F. Stone

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressional Inquisition Cannot Be Fought With ACLU-ADA Ifs and Buts

The Watkins Case Defense Only Undermines The First Amendment

The briefs filed in the U.S. Supreme Court in the Watkins case are most disappointing, and reflect the philosophical confusions of the American Civil Liberties Union (which filed the brief amicus) and the ADA (Americans for Democratic Action) whose head, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., is defense counsel for the UAW organizer. This is a test of the First Amendment as applied to inquisition by the House Un-American Activities Committee. But the pleadings make so many concessions as to leave no firm ground on which to fight. Watkins denied membership past or present, admitted close associations with the Communists but declined on First Amendment grounds to inform on past associates.

A vast gulf is opened up when the main defense brief says, "We do not challenge the contention that the substantiality of congressional need for information may, on occasion, justify the compulsion of disclosures which *normally* would be protected under the First Amendment. But we do say that *unjustifiable* abridgment of liberties of association and expression, forbidden to Congress by the First Amendment, may no more be achieved by the legislature's power of inquiry than by its power to legislate." (Italics added). But the First Amendment does not say that Congress may not "unjustifiably" abridge freedom of speech, press and assembly. It says that Congress "shall make no law abridging" them. The fact that the Courts have blurred these clear words is no reason for abandoning them. Indeed, once they are abandoned, the battle is lost.

The Deceptive Test of "Normalcy"

For Chairman Walter and Senator Eastland also believe or think they believe in the First Amendment. They regard the struggle against Communism and "subversion" as a crisis which *justifies* what would *normally* be an infringement of free political association.

If the First Amendment only protects under "normal" circumstances and against "unjustifiable" abridgment, experience has shown how easily, sincerely and "honestly" fundamental liberties will be whittled away every time they are put to real test. The brake of tradition is weakened if those who believe in liberty agree in advance as both briefs do that it is all a question of degree.

This is the course charted when the ACLU brief proposes to apply the "clear and present" danger test to the question of Congressional impact on First Amendment freedoms. This test, a pragmatic pitfall from the start, has been robbed of usefulness by the Dennis case, which the ACLU cites. For as applied by Chief Justice Vinson in upholding the Smith Act, the danger may be far from clear and not at all present. The new form of the rule as adopted from Judge Learned Hand is that in each case the Courts "must ask whether the gravity of the 'evil', discounted by its improbability, justifies such invasion of free speech as is necessary to avoid the danger." Never were fundamental liberties left to a mistier guidepost.

The Conspiracy Theory

The root of the evil is the ACLU-ADA view, implicit in both briefs, that the Communist party is a "conspiracy" and as such to some degree outside the law. This leads the main brief to concede that under certain circumstances it is proper for Congress to inquire into Communist party membership, and the ACLU brief to concede that in some cases Congress might even inquire into "personal beliefs." But the Congressional witch hunt only acquires a new franchise from these concessions. The new Inquisition can only be fought by insisting that it is a prior restraint on freedom of expression, that Congress has no right to "inquire" into the political and religious beliefs guaranteed by the First Amendment, that it has no more power lawfully to ask a man about his politics than about his views of the Virgin Birth. The second firm line of defense is that under the Constitution and separation of powers a Congressional committee cannot act as a public grand jury, with a roving commission to hunt and pillory political heretics. The defense in the Watkins case only provide new weapons against the freedom it seeks to defend. The dangers of communism in no way rebut the proposition basic to the Bill of Rights. This is that freedom is unobtainable without risk.

Extra Copies of This Issue Available at Special Rates on Bulk Order

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

12/17/56

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Pre-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 301 E. Capitol St., Washington 3, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED